

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment and the following remarks are intended to fully respond to the Office Action mailed October 31, 2005. In that Office Action claims 1-15, 17-28, and 30-33 were examined, and all claims were rejected. More specifically, claims 1-7, 17-20, and 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen et al. (USPN 6,668,354); and claims 8-15, and 21-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. and Glaser (USPN 6,392,671). Reconsideration of these rejections, as they might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested.

In this Response, claims 1-5, 8-15 and 21-28 have been amended; claims 17-20 and 30-33 have been canceled; and claims 34-38 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-16, 21-28 and 34-38 remain present for examination.

**Interview Summary**

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Pillai for her time and her help during the telephone interview conducted on December 28, 2005. During the interview, Examiner Pillai explained comments in the October 31, 2005 Office Action and provided clarification about the interpretation of the claims. In the interview, Examiner Pillai provided some suggestions for modifications to the claims that would provide allowable material.

As such, the binary file has been modified to a shared binary file to connote that the binary file is used by several applications to render controls, some of those applications not being able to use a non-binary theme file. Thus, the claims were modified to show that the shared binary file allowed some “unthemeable” applications to render controls using the theme. Further, the graphical components were clarified to be controls of the application and not documents or items in the application, such as a web page. Applicants believe, according to Examiner Pillai’s suggestions, that these amendments now place the present claims in a state of allowance and such action is requested at the Examiner’s earliest convenience.

**Conclusion**

This Amendment fully responds to the Office Action mailed October 31, 2005. Still, that Office Action may contain arguments and rejections and that are not directly addressed by this Amendment due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the preceding amendments and

arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicant believes the argument has merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

Date: January 31, 2006



Tadd F. Wilson  
Attorney Reg. No. 54,544  
Merchant & Gould P.C.  
3200 IDS Center  
80 South Eighth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-2215  
303.357.1651